

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 have been canceled. Claims 18-37 are presented for examination and Applicants have amended claims 18, 30 and 37. The Examiner has objected to claims 18, 28, 30 and 37 and rejected claims 18 - 37. In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Response to the §112 Rejections:

The Examiner has objected to claims 18, 28, 30, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph. Applicants have amended the claims to overcome the objections.

Response to Rejections Under §103(a):

The Examiner has rejected claims 18, 23-25, 28-35 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Twerdochlib et al. in view of Gray (USPN 4,131,889). In particular, the Examiner reads Twerdochlib et al. as disclosing the claimed invention except for performing stress analysis via a frequency analysis. The Examiner reads Gray as disclosing these missing elements and believes that it would have been obvious to combine Twerdochlib et al. with Gray.

Applicants respectfully submit that the portions of Gray cited by the Examiner (Gray col. 1, lines 10-26; col. 2, lines 25-44; col. 3lines 3-9, and 36-45) merely recite a Doppler radar system having a transmitter source and antenna, a pulsing means, an integrator, an amplifier/filter and comparator for determining the presence of a moving target. Gray makes no mention of determining stresses of any kind let alone stresses of a component via a frequency analysis. Therefore the combination of Twerdochlib et al. in view of Grey still fails to teach or suggest the limitation of determining the stress of a component by frequency analysis as claimed in Applicants invention.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully contend that the combination of Twerdochlib et al. and Grey does not anticipate Applicants claimed invention as embodied in independent claims 18, 30 and 37. Dependant claims 19-22, 25-27, 34 and 36 are also patentable based on their dependency from independent claims 18 and 30 as well as on their own merit.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 18 - 37.

Conclusion

For the forgoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections submitted in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/21/07

By: John P. Musone

John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830